

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
[amandas@potterhandy.com](mailto:amandas@potterhandy.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Orange Kat Investments LLC**, a  
California Limited Liability  
Company

Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of: Americans With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Orange Kat Investments LLC, a  
California Limited Liability Company; and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Orange Kat Investments LLC owned the real property located at or about 4040 Papazian Way, Fremont, California, upon which the business "Fremont Schwinn Cyclery" operates, in June 2019 and August

1 2020.

2 3. Defendant Orange Kat Investments LLC owns the real property located  
3 at or about 4040 Papazian Way, Fremont, California, upon which the business  
4 “Fremont Schwinn Cyclery” (“Store”) operates, currently.

5 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
6 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
7 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
8 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
9 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is  
10 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
11 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
12 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants  
13 are ascertained.

14  
15 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

16 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
17 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
18 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

19 6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
20 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
21 the same transactions, is also brought under California’s Unruh Civil Rights  
22 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

23 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
24 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
25 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

26  
27 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

28 8. Plaintiff went to the Store in June 2019 and August 2020 with the

1 intention to avail himself of its goods motivated in part to determine if the  
2 defendants comply with the disability access laws.

3 9. The Store is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
4 accommodation, and a business establishment.

5 10. Unfortunately, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
6 to provide wheelchair accessible parking in conformance with the ADA  
7 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

8 11. The Store provides parking to its customers but fails to provide  
9 wheelchair accessible parking.

10 12. One problem that plaintiff encountered is that there was no accessible  
11 parking whatsoever in the parking lot.

12 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the parking that likely  
13 fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
14 parking available for wheelchair users.

15 14. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
16 wheelchair accessible parking.

17 15. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff  
18 personally encountered these barriers.

19 16. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
20 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
21 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

22 17. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
23 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

24 18. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
25 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
26 disabilities.

27 19. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
28 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the

1 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
2 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
3 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
4 access if complete removal were not achievable.

5 20. Plaintiff will return to the Store to avail himself of its goods and to  
6 determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is represented to  
7 him that the Store and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is currently deterred  
8 from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing barriers and his  
9 uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the site. If the barriers  
10 are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory barriers  
11 again.

12 21. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
13 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
14 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
15 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
16 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
17 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
18 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
19 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
20 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

21  
22 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**  
23 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all  
24 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

25 22. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
26 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
27 complaint.

28 23. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the

1 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any  
2 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone  
3 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.  
4 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 5 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
6 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
7 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
8 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the  
9 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those  
10 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 11 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
12 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are  
13 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 14 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the  
15 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
16 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,  
17 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the  
18 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
19 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
20 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
21 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

22 24. When a business provides parking for its customers, it must provide  
23 accessible parking.

24 25. Here, accessible parking has not been provided in conformance with the  
25 ADA Standards.

26 26. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
27 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
28 1991 Standards.

1 27. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
2 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
3 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

4 28. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
5 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

6  
7  
8 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
9 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
10 Code § 51-53.)

11 29. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
12 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
13 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
14 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
15 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
16 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
17 Civ. Code § 51(b).

18 30. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
19 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

20 31. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
21 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s  
22 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
23 privileges, or services offered.

24 32. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
25 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
26 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
27 (c).)

28 33. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing

1 discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting  
2 physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical  
3 personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

4  
5 **PRAYER:**

6 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
7 relief as follows:

8 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
9 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
10 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
11 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

12 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
13 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

14 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
15 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

16  
17  
18 Dated: October 12, 2020

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

19  
20 By:



21  
22 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
Attorney for plaintiff  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28